

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of May 28, 2008 in which claims 1-32 were rejected.

Regarding the objection to the specification, it has been amended to specifically refer to a computer readable medium. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Regarding the indefiniteness rejection of dependent claims 6, 16, and 24, the independent claims from which they depend have been amended to remove the source of the apparent contradiction. Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection is requested.

Before discussing the obviousness rejection it should be mentioned that all of the independent claims have been amended to read like amended claim 1 as follows:

1. A method comprising

forming at least one printable output from an electronic presentation of a single message that comprises multiple objects with selected objects for presentation one after another in time and sometimes at a same time, by defining a combined page or separate pages for said objects of said printable output, whereby the printable output is formable into said combined page or separate pages depending on removal of irrelevant objects and conversion of continuous objects into non-continuous objects and also depending upon both a temporal aspect and a spatial aspect for each of said multiple objects for use in said defining said combined page or separate pages including whether said multiple objects overlap a same spatial region for presentation at different times and, if so, defining a separate page for an earlier presentation object that overlaps said same spatial region for a later presentation object so as to avoid a presentation of said multiple objects that overlap said same spatial region at said different times in said combined page.

This amendment makes it clear that a problem addressed and solved by the present invention has to do with how to form printable output from an electronic presentation that

comprises multiple objects with selected objects for presentation one after another in time and sometimes at a same time. In such a situation, it would be undesirable to combine on a same page an earlier presentation object that overlaps a same spatial region of a later presentation object such as exemplified in Figures 3 and 4 of the present disclosure. The invention avoids a presentation in the combined printable output page of such multiple objects that overlap a same spatial region at different times in the presentation.

In the obviousness rejection of claims 1-32, the Examiner cites *Furon* (US 2006/0052118) in view of *Hull* (US 2005/0010409). As stated in previous responses, *Furon* does not show the printable output formable into the combined page or separate pages depending on a spatial aspect including whether the multiple objects overlap and, if so, depending upon a temporal aspect including closeness in time of overlapping objects to a same object within the presentation so as to control the overlap in the combined page.

This is exemplified in Figs. 5a and 5b in the lower half of each flow chart beginning with the blocks starting with the phrase “spatial overlap.” In Fig. 5a, a determination is made as to whether there is a spatial overlap with another object. If so, a determination is made of the closeness of time of overlapping objects to a same object within the presentation. Steps are then taken to control the overlap in the combined page. The same may be said for Fig. 5b except that Fig. 5a treats the objects one at a time whereas Fig. 5b treats them all at the same time. The way this may be understood is by reference to Fig. 4D of the present application where it is shown that the images IM1 and IM2 overlap and only one of them is picked to be associated with images IM3 and IM4, i.e., image IM2 because it is closer in time to images IM3 and IM4 than is image IM1. *Furon et al* do not show this kind of a solution in their sequential analysis, relational analysis or semantic analysis leading to their optimal layout. It is to be emphasized that “onset of an object” claimed in claim 2 of the present invention is not the same as the beginning of a message as presented by *Furon* [0034]. The Examiner incorrectly refers to [0034] where it is disclosed that a sequential analysis is performed for each selected and validated initial multimedia message, not for objects in the message as in

the present application. This same comment applies to paragraph [0037] and to relational analysis.

The onset in claim 2 is therefore not the beginning of the message, but the time when an object appears in the message.

It is appreciated that the present application describes multimedia presentation (or multimedia message) to be something that consists of several different media types (p. 1, line 15). It is described (p. 2 at lines 3-12) that a SMIL presentation can be used for programming complex multimedia presentations comprising text, sound, images, video, animation or a combination of them. The SMIL presentation may contain spatial aspects, temporal aspects and even interaction aspects. It is further disclosed on p. 3, lines 5-10 in the present application that “object” refers to any multimedia element being delivered in a message carrying one or more multimedia elements, and that the element can be an image element, a text element, an interaction element, a video element, an audio element, etc. The multimedia presentation is thus composed of a temporal appearance of these elements within single message. The temporal study performed for the message is actually defining the time when the objects appear in the message. When looking Figure 4a-d of the present application, an example multimedia presentation can be understood better. When the presentation of Fig 4 is played by the electronic device, the user is first shown an image IM1 of Fig. 4a. After that the image IM1 changes to the one presented by Fig. 4b. The image IM2 of Fig. 4b is then completed by IM3 as shown by Fig. 4c and further by IM4 as shown by Fig. 4d. The onset times of these dynamically appearing images are the ones being studied in order to perform a static print-out.

This feature is not disclosed by *Furon* and therefore the Examiner cites *Hull* disclosing a representation of time-based media. As far as the applicant is concerned, the time aspect is not mentioned by *Hull* or any of the CIP-applications referred in INID code [63] or the provisionals in INID code [60] and therefore *Hull* (because post-dating

applicants' filing date) could not be used for the rejection. However, aside from that, after reading *Hull* and the paragraphs referred by the Examiner, following can also be mentioned:

First of all, even though *Hull* uses multimedia as an example, the *Hull's* solution is in fact targeted to a multimedia consisting of only one medium type. *Hull* describes "multimedia" to any one of or any combination of text information, graphics information, animation information, slides information, etc. [0034] but the multimedia data that is processed according to *Hull's* solution is composed of only one media type, i.e. audio data or video data. *Hull* leaves open how multimedia of more than one media types could be processed. As suggested above concerning the present invention, the question relating to time is when an object of certain media type appears in the message. In *Hull* the question relating to time is, when a certain event (applause, speech, saxophone solo) appears within the certain media type. The time determined for *Hull* is then set to the print-out at the exact location of the media (e.g. waveform) where the event occurred.

Examiner says that *Hull* teaches printing temporally close data of multimedia presentation onto a combined page and refers paragraph [0057]. On paragraph 0057 it is disclosed that text includes portions of a transcript of a conversation (that is recorded and is the audio waveform in question). The portions correspond to the marked locations along the waveform. Even though the text and the audio have been presented as overlapping events in the print-out, in the multimedia source they are exactly the same. They are just different forms of the same medium. Yet in other words, in *Hull* the media source provides audio that is processed to be a printable waveform and a corresponding printable transcription. These two are then printed out. According to the present invention there can be a presentation already comprising an audio and text (two different types of medium) and these are printed out. However, according to the present invention, audio may be replaced by an icon ("conversion of continuous objects into non-continuous objects").

The Examiner states that for the temporal aspect of *Furon* it would have been obvious to have determined the closeness in time of overlapping objects to a same object in the

multimedia message because *Hull* taught it was important to combine temporally related content of a multimedia presentation.

However, the temporal aspect of *Furon* is already inapposite, because as mentioned above, *Furon* does not disclose temporal aspect of objects, but temporal aspect of messages. Similarly temporally related content of *Hull* differs from the present solution, because in *Hull*, the content is, as said, of the same media type wherefrom occurrences can be identified. These occurrences, according to *Hull*, are combined in the same print-out with the source content. It is difficult to realize how a skilled person could have been utilized *Furon's* solution in view of *Hull's* solution in order to arrive to a present invention because neither document discloses a presentation comprising temporally appearing objects, the temporal aspect of which needs to be studied for printing purposes.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of May 28, 2008, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-32, as amended, to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis J. Maguire/

Francis J. Maguire  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, Connecticut 06468  
(203) 261-1234